

MAKE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| In re Patent Application of | MAIL STOP AF |
|---|----------------------------|
| Dr. Michael Alan Morris et al. | Group Art Unit: 1732 |
| Application No.: 10/718,578 | Examiner: MATHIEU D VARGOT |
| Filing Date: November 24, 2003 | Confirmation No.: 1700 |
| Title: WIDE FIELD SPHERICAL LENSES AND PROTECTIVE EYEWEAR | |

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

| Sir: | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Enclo | sed is a reply for the above-identified patent application. | | | | |
| | A Petition for Extension of Time is enclosed. | | | | |
| | Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the \$\sum \$65 \$\sum \$130 fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. \§ 1.20(d) are enclosed. | | | | |
| | Also enclosed is/are: | | | | |
| | Small entity status is hereby claimed. | | | | |
| | Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the \$\Bigcup \$405 \$\Bigcup \$810 fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e). | | | | |
| | Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments <u>not</u> be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above. | | | | |
| | Applicant(s) previously submitted on for which continued examination is requested. | | | | |
| | Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least , which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i is enclosed. | | | | |
| | A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed. | | | | |

| \boxtimes | No additional claim fee is required. | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------|----------|
| | An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below: | | | | | | |
| AMENDED CLAIMS | | | | | | | |
| | | No. of Claims | Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For | Extra Claims | Rate | Additi | onal Fee |
| Total Claims | | 0 | 20 | 0 | x \$ 50 (1202) | \$ | - 0 |
| Independent Claims | | 0 | 3 | 0 | x \$ 210 (1201) | | 0 |
| ☐ If A | ☐ If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$ 370 (1203) \$ | | | | | | 0 |
| Total Claim Amendment Fee \$ | | | | | 0 | | |
| ☐ Sm | all Entity Status cla | aimed - sub | tract 50% of Tota | l Claim Ame | endment Fee | | 0 |
| TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT | | | | | \$ | 0 | |
| Charge to Deposit Account No. 02-4800 for the fee due. | | | | | | | |
| | A check in the amount of is enclosed for the fee due. | | | | | | |
| | Charge to credit card for the fee due. Form PTO-2038 is attached. | | | | | | |
| | The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate. | | | | | | |
| | | | Respectfull | y submitted | d, | | |
| | | | Buchanan | INGERSOLL | & ROONEY PC | | |

Charles F. Wieland III Registration No. 33096

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404 703 836 6620

Date October 3, 2007



NOTE: NITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| In re Patent Application of | MAIL STOP AF | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|--|
| Dr. Michael Alan Morris et al. | Group Art Unit: 1732 | | |
| Application No.: 10/718,578 | Examiner: MATHIEU D VARGOT | | |
| Filed: November 24, 2003 | Confirmation No.: 1700 | | |
| For: WIDE FIELD SPHERICAL LENSES) AND PROTECTIVE EYEWEAR | | | |

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the final Office Action dated July 3, 2007. Claims 1-7 are currently pending.

As an initial matter, the undersigned would like to apologize for the cursory nature of the arguments presented in the Amendment of June 21, 2007. It is apparent that the arguments were too cursory insofar as it does not appear that the Office was able to fully appreciate them. The following embellishes on the earlier arguments and presents additional arguments which help to explain the reasons Applicants believe the pending claims to be patentable.

The final Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Volk (U.S. Patent No. 3,623,800) in view of Applicants' description of prior art at paragraphs 8, 9 and 38 of Applicants' own